

Application No. 10/719,325
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

R E M A R K S

The Examiner is thanked for conducting a telephone interview on July 14, 2005.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended as discussed in the telephone interview on July 14, 2005, to clarify that a single one of the left and right straight frames has an additional connection to the blade at a center position of the blade that is equidistant between two sides of the blade in a lengthwise direction thereof. See, for example, Figs. 1 and 2.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to claims 1 and 7 be approved and entered.

It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that as discussed in the telephone interview on July 14, 2005, amended independent claim 1 and 7 clearly distinguish over JP 64-14251 ("Matsumoto et al"), taken singly or in combination with any of the other cited references, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

As explained in detail in the Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 filed on February 22, 2005, in Matsumoto et al the connection point of the tug link 9 and the blade 3 is off-set with respect to the center of the blade, near one of the elevating cylinders 8₁ and 8₂.

By contrast, according to the present invention recited in amended independent claims 1 and 7, the single arm connects the singly one of the left and right straight frames to the blade at

Application No. 10/719,325
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

a center position of the blade that is equidistant between two sides of the blade in a lengthwise direction thereof. And as explained in detail in the Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 filed on February 22, 2005, with this structure it is possible to use a cross joint or a ball joint to connect the single arm to the blade at joint J3C in Fig. 1, whereas according to Matsumoto et al the joints 15 and 13 must both be ball joints (which are more expensive than cross joints).

In addition, according to the claimed present invention, since the single arm connects the single one of the left and right straight frames to the blade at a center position of the blade that is equidistant between two sides of the blade in a lengthwise direction thereof, the clearance between the single arm and the vehicle main body is increased, thereby reducing the interference between the single arm and the vehicle main body so as to allow the blade according to the present invention to be positioned closer to the vehicle main body than is possible with the structure of Matsumoto et al. And as explained in the Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 filed on February 22, 2005, the single arm of the present invention is connected to the center of the blade (equidistant between two sides of the blade) in consideration of the trade-offs between the distance between the blade and the vehicle main body, and the increase in stress on the joint of the single arm caused by increasing the angle formed between the single arm and the vehicle body.

Application No. 10/719,325
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

It is respectfully submitted that Matsumoto et al clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest the above described structural feature and advantageous effects of the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 7 whereby the single one of the left and right straight frames to the blade at a center position of the blade that is equidistant between two sides of the blade in a lengthwise direction thereof.

And it is respectfully submitted that JP 2546933, USP 3,656,558 and USP 3,974,881 also do not disclose, teach or suggest this feature of the claimed present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 and 7, and claims 2-6 and 8-12 respectively depending therefrom, all clearly patentably distinguish over Matsumoto et al, taken singly or in combination with any of the other cited prior art references, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the

Application No. 10/719,325
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt
action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv
encs.